

## REMARKS

An interview summary was received from the Office concerning a telephone interview held on 3 August (New Zealand time) and 2 August (U.S. time). I requested clarification of the examiner's objection to claim 20 in which he had described the language of the claim as being unclear. *"It would appear that the lot is dependent only on the movement of the elements longitudinally of said axis in relation to the first member because the second member and the elements are engaged together."* (examiner's words quoted from paragraph 1 of the Office Action)

On the basis of the interview, I determined that the examiner had tried an interpretation of the claim in which the second member and the limiter were one. Upon reflection, I concluded that I could afford to make the point clearer in the claim, that the second member and the limiter were separate and were slidable one in relation to the other longitudinally of the axis.

During the interview I mentioned the language in claim 1 of U.S. pat 4,632,399 (Bern). However I did not have the patent in front of me at the time of the interview and later when examining the claim, I found that it did contain a mention of the first and second members being mutually engaged longitudinally of the axis - a matter I had omitted in claim 20.

Some other language I have added to claim 20 effectively joins claim 20 with the old claim 25, now canceled. This was done in response to paragraph 4 of the Office Action, as I have further explained in the following remarks which address the Office Action.

In response to paragraph 1 of the Office Action, I am submitting replacement sheets for sheets 1 and 2 of the drawing. The element 142 could be seen in figure 4, however an orphaned element 95 was detected in figures 2 and 7 and another orphan 92 was detected in figure 6. The reference numbers 95 and 92 were not present in the specification so I have removed these numbers from the drawing. Element 142 occurs in the upper left part of figure 4.

In response to paragraph 2 of the Office Action, I have capitalised the first letter of each claim in the current listing. I have also changed the language in which the extraneous object is mentioned in claim 5 so that it should be clear that the object is included. The other objection concerning lines 15 - 17 of claim 20 was the subject of the telephone interview and amendments to claim 20 are proposed, as outlined above.

In response to paragraph 4 of the Office Action, I have included the lid as part of claim 20, so that the old claim 25 is effectively now represented in claim 20. I have also proposed to remove some redundant material from the specification, so that the specification and the claims tie in together as one.

The move to include the lid in the main claim was one of three options that were presented to me in the Office Action. It seemed to result in a more elegant statement of claim than either of the other two options. For anything to have a lid-like relationship to a housing, the housing must surely define something of a hollow, more particularly if a storage space is required. By contrast, there is no hollow defined in element 84 of the prior art puzzler.

I had conceived the lid as having a particular form, yet the elegance of the lid claim is extended if certain descriptions of the lid form are omitted. The

descriptions which I seek to remove from the specification are light-weight material and add nothing of substance to the specification.

Thank you for considering these amendments.